PROJECT-227

THE UTILIZATION OF COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTRES

by
Patrick G. Madden
Silvia Hermann
Planning and Research Branch

Ministry of Correctional Services

Honourable
Nicholas G. Leluk
Minister
DR. G.R. Podrebarac
Deputy Minister

October 1983

MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

PLANNING AND SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION

M.J. Algar
Executive Director

PLANNING AND RESEARCH BRANCH

A.C. Birkenmayer
Manager, Research Services

PROJECT STAFF

Maggy Rafla
Elizabeth Blight
Catherine Carey
Anu Timmelmann

ISBN-0-7743-8973-7

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Sincere appreciation is extended to the following individuals, who gave generously of their time to contribute to the research:

- The C.R.C. Directors, Institution Superintendents and staff who patiently sat through lengthy interviews.
- The C.R.C. staff who diligently filled out the C.R.C. Release Summary Form for each resident in the study sample.
- The institutional staff at Elgin-Middlesex D.C., Hamilton-Wentworth D.C., Mimico C.C. and Rideau C.C. who provided information regarding the inmates denied entrance to the C.R.C. programme.
- Sue Hyne and George Simpson of the Inmate Transfer and Classification Branch who clarified the classification system and it's relationship to the C.R.C. programme.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Acknowledgements		i
Table of Contents		iii
List of Tables		v
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	METHODOLOGY	3
	A. The C.R.C. Resident Sample	3
	B. Inmates Denied Entrance to a C.R.C.	3
	C. The Interviews	3
III	RESULTS	5
	A. Aims of the C.R.C. Programme	5
	B. The Process Leading to a C.R.C. Transfer	5
	C. C.R.C. Resident Selection Criteria	6
	i. Selection Criteria	6
	ii. Reasons for Denial to a C.R.C. Programme	8
	iii. Appropriate Length of C.R.C. Stay	10
	iv. Characteristics of the C.R.C. Residents.	11
	a) Demographics	11
	b) Criminal History	11
	c) The Current Incarceration	13
	D. Activities of C.R.C. Residents	15
	i. Employment	15
	ii. Job Search Activities	16
	iii. Education	17
	iv. Community Work Placements	17
	v. In-house and Community Based Programmes.	18
	vi. Programmes Recommended but not Implemented	19

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
vii. Treatment	19
viii.Pre-Release Planning	19
E. C.R.C. Resident Performance	20
i. Overall Level of Performance	20
ii. C.R.C. Rule Infractions	21
iii. Escape/Unlawfully at Large Activity	22
iv. Reasons for Termination of C.R.C. Stay .	23
v. Residents Returned to the Institution ..	24
F. Factors Related to C.R.C. Success	24
i. Demographic Factors	25
ii. Criminal History	26
iii. Current Offence(s)	27
G. Perceived Problems Within the C.R.C. Network.	29
H. The Potential Expansion of the C.R.C. Programme	30
i. Current Situation	31
ii. The Use of C.R.C.'s for Remanded Individuals, Probationers and Parolees .	34
IV. DISCUSSION	35
V. REFERENCES	38
Appendix A.	39

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	AIMS OF THE C.R.C. PROGRAMME	5
2	SELECTION CRITERIA TO BE CONSIDERED UPON C.R.C. APPLICATION	7
3	C.R.C. DENIALS	9
4	RESIDENTS' LENGTH OF STAY AT C.R.C.	10
5	PRIOR CRIMINAL DISPOSITIONS	11
6	TYPE OF PREVIOUS OFFENCE(S)	12
7	NUMBER OF OFFENCE COUNTS LEADING TO CURRENT INCARCERATION	13
8	PRESENT OFFENCE(S) TYPE	14
9	LENGTH OF CURRENT SENTENCE	15
10	RESIDENTS ACTIVITIES DURING C.R.C. STAY	16
11	WHEN EMPLOYMENT OBTAINED	16
12	NUMBER OF PROGRAMMES ATTENDED DURING C.R.C. STAY	18
13	OVERALL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE AT C.R.C.	20
14	NUMBER OF INFRACTIONS OF C.R.C. RULES	21
15	TYPE OF C.R.C. RULE INFRACTIONS	22
16	EXPLANATION OF ESCAPE, UNLAWFULLY AT LARGE OR LATE ACTIVITIES	23
17	REASON FOR COMPLETION OF C.R.C. STAY	23
18	REASON RETURNED TO INSTITUTION	24
19	DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS RELATED TO COMPLETION STATUS	25
20	PRIOR CRIMINAL DISPOSITION BY COMPLETION STATUS.	26
21	NUMBER OF OFFENCE COUNTS LEADING TO PRESENT SENTENCE BY COMPLETION STATUS	27
22	MOST SERIOUS PRESENT OFFENCE BY COMPLETION STATUS	28
23	PRESENT AGGREGATE SENTENCE BY COMPLETION STATUS.	29
24	C.R.C. BEDS PER 10,000 SENTENCED ADMISSIONS	32
25	C.R.C. UTILIZATION BY T.A. INMATES (1982-83) ...	33

I INTRODUCTION

Community Resource Centres (C.R.C.'s) have been in operation on a contractual basis with the Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services since 1974. Originally, C.R.C.'s were designed to provide a community residential setting for inmates completing a sentence of incarceration. In the last few years, C.R.C. use has expanded to permit the housing of probationers, parolees and/or persons held on remand.

Growing concern has been expressed about the marked increase in the number of incarcerated persons in Ontario Correctional facilities and the potential problems associated with overcrowding. It has been suggested that an expanded use of C.R.C.'s offers the potential to help alleviate this situation.

An examination of daily C.R.C. counts as reported by the institutions revealed that the rate of C.R.C. utilization for inmates has remained constant at approximately 75% or 302 residents during 1981 and 1982. As institutional counts have been rising steadily over this period, there is concern as to why this increase is not reflected in the C.R.C.'s counts. If C.R.C.'s are truly an alternative to incarceration for minimum security inmates, the counts at C.R.C.'s could be expected to rise accordingly.

The statistics compiled at the C.R.C.'s show a utilization rate approaching 100% for the fiscal year 1981-82. However, this is because the C.R.C.'s include remanded individuals, probationers and parolees in their counts while institutional statistics include only those residents who are serving a sentence of incarceration at the C.R.C. In addition, the method by which counts are calculated by the C.R.C.'s differs from the institutional method[1].

This study examines the extent to which C.R.C.'s are utilized to house offenders who would otherwise be incarcerated in a provincial institution for the duration of their sentence. Specifically, the following questions are addressed:

1) Can utilization be increased in existing C.R.C.'s?

2) What types of changes would facilitate an increase in C.R.C. utilization?

3) Is the utilization of C.R.C.'s in housing probationers, parolees and/or remanded

---

[1] *C.R.C.'s calculate counts on a weekly basis and include residents who stay at the C.R.C. for any part of the week in accord with the way in which funding is based. Institutions base statistics on daily figures and only count the actual number of days each inmate spent at the C.R.C. Thus, figures compiled by the C.R.C.'s are higher than those calculated by the institutions.*

individuals limiting the number of sentenced inmates placed in C.R.C.'s?

4) Should the number of C.R.C.'s be increased in certain areas of the province?

II METHODOLOGY

There were three major components to this project. The first consisted of an examination of a sample of C.R.C. residents. The second examined reasons for denial of C.R.C. applications. The final component solicited the views and concerns of institutional and C.R.C. staff involved in C.R.C. selection and programming.

A. THE C.R.C. RESIDENT SAMPLE

In order to provide a profile of C.R.C. residents transferred from provincial institutions, data were collected on all residents whose C.R.C. stays were terminated between February 1, 1982 and May 15, 1982. The C.R.C. stay was considered terminated when the resident was paroled, had satisfied his/her sentence, was returned to the institution or had escaped. Remanded individuals, probationers and parolees were not included in this study.

Data concerning 576 C.R.C. residents (559 males and 17 females) were collected on two instruments designed specifically for this study: the C.R.C. Release Summary Form and the Criminal History Coding Form. The C.R.C. Release Summary Form, which was completed by C.R.C. staff, included information regarding an offender's experience and behaviour at the C.R.C. With the cooperation of several C.R.C.'s in the Toronto area, this form was pretested in January, 1982.

The Criminal History Form was completed for each C.R.C. resident based on profiles created from the Adult Information System (A.I.S.) maintained by this Ministry. It included a description of criminal activity prior to the offender's C.R.C. incarceration, an overview of current offence(s) and demographic data.

B. INMATES DENIED ENTRANCE TO A C.R.C.

Four institutions were asked to record the reasons for denial for each case in which the applicant was denied entrance to a C.R.C. during the study period. Reasons were documented for 189 cases. Because this information was not recorded for every application, the rejection rate was not determinable; however, the data that were obtained made it possible to identify the most frequent reasons for denying entrance to a C.R.C.

C. THE INTERVIEWS

Separate interview schedules were designed for the C.R.C. Directors and the institutional staff. These instruments were similar in format and dealt with questions concerning the everyday operation of the C.R.C.'s and the problems encountered within the C.R.C. system. Respondents

were asked what types of factors affect C.R.C. entrance, the types of misconducts for which inmates were most often returned to the institution and the kinds of problems encountered in C.R.C. operations. They were also asked whether they thought it was possible to increase the use of C.R.C.'s in their areas.

Interviews were conducted throughout Ontario with 29 C.R.C. Directors and 28 institutional staff members between January 1, 1982 and March 31, 1982. Each interview was conducted in person and took approximately one to one and one half hours to complete.

III RESULTS

A. AIMS OF THE C.R.C. PROGRAMME

The Directors of the C.R.C.'s and the provincial institutional staff members (primarily Superintendents and T.A.P. Coordinators) were asked a number of questions concerning the aims of the C.R.C. programme. The maintenance of employment and facilitating a person's gradual re-entry into the community were considered to be the two primary aims of a C.R.C. by all of the people interviewed. However, C.R.C.'s were also seen as fulfilling other aims, particularly the maintenance of familial and financial ties and the provision of an economically viable alternative to incarceration.

TABLE 1

AIMS OF THE C.R.C. PROGRAMME

AIMS	DIRECTORS N	DIRECTORS % (29)	INSTITUTIONAL STAFF N	INSTITUTIONAL STAFF % (28)
Maintain employment	29	100.0	28	100.0
Gradual re-entry into community	29	100.0	28	100.0
Effective counselling and rehabilitation via C.R.C. & community support agencies	18	62.1	6	21.4
Maintain familial-financial ties	11	37.9	10	35.7
Viable alternative to incarceration	6	20.7	4	14.3
Alleviate institutional overcrowding	0	0.0	9	32.1

One third of the institutional staff members stated that alleviating institutional overcrowding was a primary aim of the C.R.C. programme. In contrast, C.R.C. Directors tended to feel that rehabilitation, through effective counselling and the utilization of community support agencies, was a primary aim of the C.R.C. programme.

B. THE PROCESS LEADING TO A C.R.C. TRANSFER

In order to determine whether any variance exists in the inmate selection process, institutional staff were asked to describe C.R.C. application procedures utilized at their institution. Primarily one process was outlined. Following

an inmate's request for transfer to a C.R.C., he/she is interviewed by a C.R.C. board, usually consisting of two institutional staff (a Classification Officer and a T.A.P. Coordinator) and, in most cases, a C.R.C. Director. A community investigation is conducted by an institutional staff member to confirm various information submitted for consideration. If the C.R.C. board approves the inmate, the Superintendent of the institution considers and approves the transfer and the inmate is sent to a C.R.C. when a bed is available. At 7 of the institutions, C.R.C. Directors were not included in the C.R.C. board interview. However, in these institutions, the Director interviewed the inmate following the Superintendent's approval of the application and prior to the inmate's transfer to the C.R.C.

In most cases, placement in a C.R.C. is requested by the inmate. However, C.R.C. placement is also considered in cases in which the Judge recommended that the inmate be placed in a Temporary Absence Programme immediately after sentencing.

C. C.R.C. RESIDENT SELECTION CRITERIA

i. Selection Criteria

The C.R.C. Directors and the institutional staff members were asked what factors they considered when they reviewed C.R.C. applications. The subjects considered it important to look at the needs of the inmate and the C.R.C.'s ability to meet those needs; the inmate's motivation and willingness to work on problem areas; the inmate's willingness or ability to maintain employment; the inmate's criminal record; the inmate's potential risk to the community; and the inmate's institutional conduct. Approximately one-third of the institutional staff members felt that the length of an inmate's sentence should be considered. (See Table 2).

A portion of those interviewed felt that no set criteria should be established. They felt each offender should be considered individually, and the circumstances surrounding an offence should be examined before barring an inmate from C.R.C. entrance.

Generally the respondents felt that inmates with psychiatric problems, serious drug or alcohol abuse problems, prior sex offences, prior violent offences, prior arson offences, prior escapes or prior poor institutional/C.R.C. conduct, were not suited to the C.R.C. programme.

TABLE 2

SELECTION CRITERIA TO BE CONSIDERED UPON C.R.C. APPLICATION

CRITERIA	DIRECTORS (N=29)	INSTITUTIONAL STAFF (N=28)	EXCLUSIONARY CRITERIA	DIRECTORS (N=29)	INSTITUTIONAL STAFF (N=28)
Needs of inmate & C.R.C.'s ability to meet those needs	9	11	-Deep rooted psychiatric problem -Heavy drug/Alcohol use	6 7	7 9
Inmates motivation, attitude	15	16			
Willingness to work/ job potential	9	14	-Unemployed / no job skills	1	2
Length of sentence	0	9	-Sentence too long/short	0	4
Criminal Record (current & prior)/Outstanding charges	21	28	-Sex offender -Violent offender -Arsonist -Outstanding charges	16 19 12 1	16 18 12 2
Risk to community/escape risk	14	17	-Escape risk	0	7
Prior Institutional/ CRC Conduct	4	14	-Poor previous conduct	3	5
Everyone to be considered/ no set criteria	8	9	-No criteria should be considered exclusionary	3	10

ii. Reasons for Denial to a C.R.C. Programme

Every inmate's application to the C.R.C. programme is reviewed by a board of institutional representatives and C.R.C. Directors. When an application is not approved, the inmate is informed of the board's reasons for denial. The most frequent reasons for denial are described below.

The reasons for denial were not collected systematically nor were the four institutions involved necessarily representative of the whole province. Thus, the data should not be interpreted as definitive, but rather should be taken as an indication as to the reasons for denying inmates C.R.C. residency.

Among the institutions studied, there was a notable diversity in the reasons most frequently given for turning down a C.R.C. application. (See Table 3.) At Hamilton-Wentworth Detention Centre, the reason stated most frequently (38, 40.4%) was the lack of employment or educational opportunity. The institution's policy, as reported by staff, is to require confirmation of employment or school programme prior to approving a C.R.C. application. This ensures that inmates with jobs in place have first access to available C.R.C. beds.

At Mimico Correctional Centre, the most frequently reported reason for denial was the unsuitably short sentence length of the applicant. Staff reported that inmates with less than three weeks remaining in their sentence are sent to a special temporary absence unit within the institution rather than filling a C.R.C. bed which could be used for longer term inmates. The second most frequently given reason for denial at Mimico was the inmate's poor conduct when previously serving time in a C.R.C.

At Rideau Correctional Centre, police and/or community objection to the inmate's participation in a C.R.C. programme was the reason given most frequently for the denial. It should be noted that these inmates may have been considered unsuitable for the C.R.C. programme at the time of sentencing as they were sent to a Correctional Centre, usually to serve longer terms of incarceration (i.e. over 3 months).

At Elgin-Middlesex Detention Centre, police and/or community objections and lack of employment or educational opportunities were the reasons most frequently given for denial.

Lack of available space in a C.R.C. was cited in only one of the 189 cases.

TABLE 3

C.R.C. DENIALS

REASON DENIED	HAMILTON-WENTWORTH D.C.	MIMICO C.C.	RIDEAU C.C.	ELGIN-MIDDLESEX D.C.	N	TOTAL %
No employment/school opportunities	38	0	0	5	43	22.75
Police objected/community objected	1	3	15	6	25	13.23
Too short a sentence	2	13	0	0	15	7.94
Serious offence history (violent)	10	1	0	2	13	6.88
Not a suitable candidate (P.C.)	9	1	0	2	12	6.35
Poor previous C.R.C. conduct	0	9	1	2	12	6.35
Long sentence/short time served	5	2	0	4	11	5.82
Outstanding charges	7	1	1	1	10	5.29
Heavy drug/alcohol use	3	5	0	1	9	4.76
Poor institutional conduct	2	5	1	0	8	4.23
Pre-release more appropriate	6	0	0	0	6	3.17
Will not lose job while incarcerated	5	0	0	1	6	3.17
Escape risk too great	3	0	0	2	5	2.65
Parole violator	0	4	0	1	5	2.65
Poor attitude/easy jail	0	2	1	1	4	2.12
Recidivist	1	0	1	0	2	1.06
Fine-time option	1	0	0	0	1	0.53
Further assessment required	1	0	0	0	1	0.53
C.R.C. full	0	0	1	0	1	0.53
TOTAL	94	46	21	28	189	100.00

iii. Appropriate Length of C.R.C. Stay

All of the C.R.C. Directors and half of the institutional staff stated that no restrictions should be placed on the length of a resident's stay in a C.R.C.. A portion of the sample (15-D, 6-I)[2] expressed the opinion that lengthy placements (i.e. over 6 months) increased the probability of failure in the programme.

On the other hand, almost one-half of the respondents felt that a short placement (i.e. under 2 weeks) did not permit the resident to benefit from the programmes available through the C.R.C. (18-D, 8-I). One C.R.C. Director stated that he generally did not accept residents with a stay of less than 1 week. In the past, these short term residents had proven to be a disruptive influence in the C.R.C.. The optimum length of stay cited was 3 to 6 months.

The C.R.C. Directors and institutional staff members seem to over-estimate the average length of C.R.C. placements. Over seventy percent of the respondents estimated the average stay to be two months. However, when the researcher examined the length of stay for residents, it was noted that half of the residents remained less than one month. The actual length of stay ranged from 1 to 235 days but only 7% of the residents stayed more than three months.

TABLE 4

RESIDENTS' LENGTH OF STAY AT C.R.C.

LENGTH (DAYS)	N	%
1 to 7	79	13.71
8 to 30	207	35.94
31 to 60	201	34.90
61 to 90	47	8.16
91 to 120	25	4.34
121 to 150	11	1.91
151 +	6	1.04
TOTAL	576	100.00

Mean stay at C.R.C. = 38 days.

Median stay at C.R.C. = 31 days.

[2] *"I" following a number indicates the frequency of response for institutional staff, while "D" indicates the frequency of response for C.R.C. Directors.*

iv. Characteristics of the C.R.C. Residents

There was a considerable amount of data collected on the sample of C.R.C. residents selected for this study. Much of it, while it may be useful in other ways, does not speak directly to the focus of this study. The following section briefly outlines the more relevant aspects of this data. More detailed information is included in the appendix in tabular form.

a) Demographics - The C.R.C. residents were typically male (97%) and between the ages of 21 and 35. The majority were single (64%), resided with their parents (34%), and had grade 10 or less education (60%). Most had been employed in labour or semi-skilled occupations at intervals in the past (54%).

b) Criminal History - Approximately sixty percent (342) of the C.R.C. residents had a record of a prior conviction while forty-six percent had been previously incarcerated. The most severe dispositions received by each of the residents are summarized below.

TABLE 5

PRIOR CRIMINAL DISPOSITIONS*

PRIOR SENTENCE	N	%
No previous conviction	234	40.6
Previous fine	1	0.2
Previous probation	76	13.2
Previous incarceration <90 days	155	26.9
Previous incarceration ≥ 90 days <2 years	105	18.2
Previous incarceration ≥ 2 years	5	0.9
TOTAL	576	100.0

* Recorded by most severe disposition.

Few of the C.R.C. residents had any record of escape/unlawfully at large (29, 5.0%) or parole revocation (20, 3.5%).

The Ministry's A.I.S. indicated that eighteen percent of the residents had previously been sentenced for one offence while over twenty percent of the residents had previously been sentenced for five or more offences. The residents had been convicted on a mean of 3.6 counts prior to their C.R.C. incarceration. The number of prior offences ranged from 0 to 66.

In order to examine another aspect of criminal history, all of the aggregate sentences issued to the C.R.C. residents prior to the current incarceration were totalled[3]. The mean total length of prior aggregate sentences was 96 days. Sixteen percent had been sentenced to less than a month in total while twenty-one percent had been sentenced to between one and twelve months in total. Less than five percent had been sentenced to more than a total of two years incarceration prior to their current term. The total prior aggregate sentences ranged from ten days to six years.

The researcher also examined the previous types of offences for which the residents had been convicted. The categories were not mutually exclusive and therefore, if an offender had been convicted of two different types of offences, he was counted in both categories.

The data in table 6 indicate that although criminal history was considered upon a resident's C.R.C. application, several offenders with serious prior offences were accepted as C.R.C. residents.

TABLE 6

TYPE OF PREVIOUS OFFENCE(S)

OFFENCE TYPE	N	% (N=576)
Previous serious offence (murder, robbery, arson, rape)	62	10.8
Previous sex offence	6	1.0
Previous alcohol related offence	167	29.0
Previous drug related offence	45	7.8
Previous escape/U.A.L.	29	5.0

---

3 Prior aggregate sentences were calculated using the Ministry's Adult Information System which became operative in 1975. Information regarding activities prior to 1975 was not available.

c) The Current Incarceration - The data in Table 7 indicate that almost one-half of the residents were serving time for more than one offence. Over one-quarter had been convicted of between three and nine separate offences.

TABLE 7

NUMBER OF OFFENCE COUNTS

LEADING TO CURRENT INCARCERATION

NO OF COUNTS	NO. OF RESIDENTS	%
1	298	51.8
2	125	21.7
3-5	116	20.1
6-9	37	6.4
TOTAL	576	100.0

An examination of the most serious offence for each of the residents revealed that over a third of the sample were incarcerated for charges related to break and enter, theft, possession of stolen property or fraud. Break and enter and related charges accounted for over half of these offences.

Almost a quarter of the total residents had been incarcerated for impaired driving or other alcohol related offences.

Relatively few residents (3.6%) had been incarcerated for violent offences such as homicide, rape, robbery or sexual offences, but this figure does indicate that C.R.C.'s do accept this type of offender on occasion. (See Table 8).

The length of the aggregate sentence for the present incarceration ranged from 10 to 730 days, but over half of the residents were sentenced to 90 days or less. Only one-quarter of the sample were serving sentences of more than six months. It must be remembered that these sentences do not represent the actual time to be served. If inmates earn their full potential remission, they serve two-thirds of their sentence while those paroled serve about one-third.

TABLE 8

PRESENT OFFENCE(S) TYPE

OFFENCE TYPE	TOTAL COUNTS LEADING TO INCARCERATION N	%	MOST SERIOUS OFFENCE FOR EACH RESIDENT N	%
Homicide and Related	1	0.1	1	0.2
Serious (Violent)	14	1.4	14	2.4
Sexual (Violent)	6	0.6	6	1.0
Break & Enter and Related	113	11.4	103	17.9
Import/Traffic Drug	52	5.2	48	8.3
Involving Weapons	13	1.3	7	1.2
Fraud and Related	61	6.1	42	7.3
Against Person (Misc.)	4	0.4	1	0.2
Theft/Possession	135	13.6	59	10.2
Assault and Related	44	4.4	34	5.9
Arson/Property Damage	22	2.2	8	1.4
Morals (Misc.)	2	0.2	0	0.0
Breach Justice	26	2.6	14	2.4
Possession of Drug	50	5.0	30	5.2
Traffic (C.C. Non-Alcohol)	28	2.8	20	3.5
Breach Court Order/Escape	114	11.5	31	5.4
Traffic (C.C. Alcohol)	192	19.3	131	22.7
Against Public Order (Misc.)	17	1.7	2	0.4
Other Federal Statutes	16	1.6	5	0.9
Parole Violation	7	0.7	2	0.4
Highway Traffic Act	25	2.5	6	1.0
Liquor	32	3.2	4	0.7
Other Provincial Statutes	11	1.1	2	0.4
Other Municipal Statutes	3	0.3	0	0.0
Unknown	6	0.6	6	1.0
TOTAL	994	100.0*	576	100.0

* Rounding errors result in discrepancy

TABLE 9

LENGTH OF CURRENT SENTENCE

(Aggregate)

TIME (MONTHS)	NO.	%
Less than 1	158	27.5
1 - 3	173	30.0
3 - 6	124	21.5
6 - 12	81	14.1
12 - 18	29	5.0
18 - 24	11	1.9
TOTAL	576	100.0

Mean = 136 days

Median = 90 days

Nearly one-half (43.6%) of the residents were still under supervision following their release from the C.R.C. One-quarter of the residents (148) had been sentenced to a term of probation following their incarceration and an additional fourteen percent (80) had been released on parole.

D. ACTIVITIES OF C.R.C. RESIDENTS

i. Employment

All of the C.R.C. Directors and institutional staff members interviewed felt that employment was one of the most important factors influencing the offender's successful re-integration into the community. Therefore, it is not surprising that employment was the primary activity for C.R.C. residents throughout the province.

Three-quarters (420) of the residents in this study were employed during part, if not all, of their stay at the C.R.C. (See Table 10.) Staff clearly indicated that an inmate's employment potential is a primary consideration in the selection of residents. Moreover, all of the staff expressed a preference for selecting inmates with pre-arranged jobs. Eighty percent of the C.R.C. residents who worked during their stay had jobs arranged prior to their placement in a C.R.C. (See Table 11.)

TABLE 10

RESIDENTS ACTIVITIES DURING C.R.C. STAY

ACTIVITY	PRIMARY† ACTIVITY NO.	%	ANY* INVOLVEMENT NO.	%
Regular employment	409	71.0	420	72.9
Job search	63	10.9	151	26.2
Volunteer or community work	51	8.9	132	22.9
Educational programme	42	7.3	84	14.6
None listed	11	1.9	11	1.9
TOTAL	576	100.0	798	100.0

† This column represents the primary activity listed for each of the residents.

* This column represents all of the activities for all of the residents during their C.R.C. stay. Up to 4 activities were recorded for each resident.

TABLE 11

WHEN EMPLOYMENT OBTAINED

	N	%
Employed prior to incarceration	318	75.7
Job obtained at institution	24	5.7
Job obtained at C.R.C. (job search)	78	18.6
TOTAL	420	100.0

ii. Job Search Activities

Although there was a strong emphasis on selecting inmates with pre-arranged employment, the staff also said that job search activities represented a valuable component of C.R.C. programming. As indicated in Table 10, one-quarter (151) of the residents were involved in job search activities at some time during their stay. Over half of these residents found employment (78).

Nevertheless, reservations were expressed about the advisability of placing unemployed inmates in C.R.C.'s. Some of the staff felt that placement should be limited to inmates who possessed marketable skills and for whom suitable jobs were available in the community. A few of the staff also stated that unemployed inmates should not be allowed to remain at the C.R.C. indefinitely; however, the data indicated that "failure to find a job" resulted in a return to the institution for only 1% (5) of the residents in this study.

The apparent reluctance to place inmates with limited employment potential in C.R.C.'s is reinforced by the existing policy for funding. In addition to receiving the regular per diem paid by the Ministry, C.R.C.'s also receive approximately $42.00 per week in room and board from inmates who are working. For this reason, some of the C.R.C. Directors felt that C.R.C.'s should be expected to house only a small proportion of inmates who are unemployed.

iii. Education

Due to the lack of education generally found among offenders, all of the staff interviewed felt that C.R.C.'s should accommodate residents who were to attend school during their C.R.C. stay. However, one institutional staff member and 10 C.R.C. Directors mentioned funding as a primary concern for C.R.C.'s with a large proportion of residents involved in educational programmes, as students do not pay room and board to the C.R.C. in addition to the Ministry's per diem rate.

Approximately 15% (84) of the residents were involved with an educational programme at some point during their C.R.C. stay. Most (7.3%) were attending high school while a smaller proportion (2.8%) were attending a college or university. Twelve individuals (2.1%) were involved in upgrading programmes.

Three-quarters (64) of the student residents were enrolled in school prior to their incarceration. The remainder (20) arranged for their education programme while at the C.R.C.

iv. Community Work Placements

Approximately one-quarter of the residents (132) were involved in voluntary community work placements at some point during their C.R.C. stay. Many of the residents (81) were involved in community work in addition to their primary C.R.C. activity (usually employment). In most cases (74), these residents had only one volunteer placement, however, 39 had two placements and 19 had three.

The most frequently mentioned activities involved working for the city, community or a government agency (98

or 44.1% of total placements). Thirty-two individuals worked at park maintenance for Parks and Recreation or at snow removal (14.4% of total placements). Other placements included working with the elderly, working around the C.R.C., providing maintenance for churches, working with the disabled or children, working for a hospital and working with Natives.

Although many of the C.R.C. Directors (18) and institutional staff members (20) interviewed felt that inmates could benefit from volunteer community work, five individuals felt that great care should be taken when assigning an offender to perform community work so as not to elicit negative publicity, and to avoid situations where offenders were "forced" to volunteer for community work in order to remain at the C.R.C.

v. In-House and Community Based Programmes

The C.R.C. Directors were requested to list all of the programmes in which each of the residents were involved. It should be noted that discrepancies exist as to what constitutes a "programme". Thus, some Directors may have listed an activity as a programme while others may not have listed it as such.

Over three-quarters (454) of the residents participated in a wide range of in-house and community based programmes. In fact, one-half of the residents (270) were involved in 2 or more programmes during their C.R.C. stay.

TABLE 12

NUMBER OF PROGRAMMES ATTENDED

DURING THE C.R.C. STAY

NUMBER OF PROGRAMMES ATTENDED	NUMBER OF RESIDENTS	% OF POPULATION
None	122	21.2
1	184	31.9
2	146	25.3
3	85	14.8
4	30	5.2
5	9	1.6
TOTAL	576	100.0

The Alcoholics Anonymous programme had by far the largest number of participants for any single programme (229 or 39.8% of total residents). Recreational programmes were attended by 139 (24.1% of the residents), while 108 residents (18.8% of total) participated in a general counselling programme. Drug-alcohol therapy and education programmes other than A.A. were attended by 68 (11.8%) of the residents, while 62 (10.8%) of the residents participated in a Life Skills programme. Very few of the residents participated in financial and budget counselling programmes (3) or family counselling (5).

vi. Programmes Recommended but not Implemented

Less than 20% (105) of the residents were recommended for programmes which they did not attend. For a minority of residents (3.6%) this involved 2 or more programmes. Substance Abuse programmes (alcohol/drug) were the programmes mentioned most frequently as recommended but not attended (64 residents, 11.1%). Others included recreational programmes, educational programmes, life skills, psychiatric counselling, family counselling, Narcotics Anonymous, financial counselling, and impaired drivers' programmes.

Reasons cited for non-attendance were: refusal to attend on the part of the inmate (46), insufficient length of time at the C.R.C. to benefit from programme (27), scheduling problems with work or school (16), programme not available (15), and other needs of the resident more prominent (2),

vii. Treatment

The utilization of C.R.C.'s as treatment facilities for problem areas (drug, alcohol, familial, etc.) was supported by twenty-four of the Directors and twenty of the institutional staff members. The remainder of the individuals interviewed felt that C.R.C.'s should provide residents in-house treatment only if qualified, structured treatment facilities do not exist within the community (i.e. a drug addiction treatment facility such as Addiction Research Foundation). Many felt that the C.R.C. encouraged continued involvement with community treatment agencies following the resident's release.

viii. Pre-Release Planning

Almost all of the C.R.C. Directors and institutional staff members viewed pre-release planning as an essential component of the C.R.C. programming. They felt that the risk of recidivism was greatly reduced if the inmate returned to the community with a job, a place to live and established contacts with community agencies. Two C.R.C. Directors and six institutional staff members, however, felt that the institutions were better equipped than the C.R.C.'s to aid inmates with pre-release planning.

Of the 576 C.R.C. residents, 103 (17.9%) reported that they would be living in a community other than that of the C.R.C. following release. For this group the potential for pre-release planning was severely limited. Over two-thirds of the residents (389 or 67.5%) said they were returning to a family home and 381 (66.2%) said they were returning to an established job or school programme upon release.

One hundred and sixteen (20.1%) of the residents indicated an intention to continue their involvement with a particular agency or programme following their release. Again, Alcoholics Anonymous was the most frequently mentioned programme (42). Nineteen residents planned to continue contact with the C.R.C. through its after-care programme.

E. C.R.C. RESIDENT PERFORMANCE

i. Overall Level of Performance

Community Resource Centre staff were requested to rate the residents in terms of their overall level of performance during their C.R.C. stay. Very few residents were rated as making no effort, having many problems and being uncooperative. The majority of residents were rated as being very successful or quite successful at the C.R.C.

TABLE 13

OVERALL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE AT C.R.C.

PERFORMANCE	N	%
Not listed	7	1.2
Very successful (a lot of effort exerted)	170	29.5
Quite successful (few problems, some progress)	228	39.6
Limited success (only just complied)	127	22.0
No effort (many problems, uncooperative)	44	7.6
TOTAL	576	100.0

ii. C.R.C. Rule Infractions

C.R.C. Directors were requested to record all infractions of house rules for each of the residents. As shown in Table 14, three-quarters committed no infractions during their stay. The largest number of infractions listed for any resident was 28.

TABLE 14

NUMBER OF INFRACTIONS OF C.R.C. RULES

N (INFRACTIONS)	N (RESIDENTS)	%
0	423	73.4
1	66	11.5
2	34	5.9
3-5	33	5.7
6 or more	20	3.5
TOTAL	576	100.0

The most common infraction listed was late return from a pass, while the second most common was alcohol use. Damaging property, misuse of funds, lying, theft and smoking in a prohibited area were other infractions mentioned. (See Table 15.)

Disciplinary actions were not recorded for the 576 C.R.C. residents, however, C.R.C. Directors stated that the following punishments were given for rule infractions: return to the institution, loss of privileges or passes, loss of earned remission, downgrading of incentive allowance and extra chores.

Institutional staff members were asked if there were any rules or regulations which the institution insisted that the C.R.C. impose upon the residents. The majority (241) replied that the rules and regulations were set up in co-operation with C.R.C. Directors and were in accord with Ministry policy. Three institutions required that inmates who were identified as alcoholics attend Alcoholics Anonymous while at the C.R.C. One parent institution required that C.R.C.'s have institutional authorization prior to granting a 24 hour pass to an inmate.

TABLE 15

TYPE OF C.R.C. RULE INFRACTIONS*

TYPE	NUMBER OF INFRACTIONS	% OF TOTAL INFRACTIONS
Late return from pass	45	17.4
Alcohol Use	43	16.6
Not obeying House rules	32	12.4
Not being where they are supposed to be	31	12.0
Not doing chores	29	11.2
Disruptive behaviour	19	7.3
Drugs suspected/found	15	5.8
Late waking up	13	5.0
Violate T.A. conditions	8	3.1
Lied about having employment	7	2.7
Verbally agressive towards staff	7	2.7
Smoking in a restricted area	3	1.1
Theft	3	1.1
Lying	2	0.8
Damaging Property	1	0.4
Misuse of funds	1	0.4
TOTAL	259	100.0

* This table represents all of the infractions committed by the 576 CRC residents.

iii. Escape/Unlawfully at Large Activity

It was reported that 72 (12.5%) of the 576 residents had escaped, were unlawfully at large (U.A.L.) or had been late returning from a pass during their C.R.C. residency. Late return from a pass accounted for the largest percentage of offenders in the aforementioned category. One resident went to an unauthorized destination during a pass. Twenty-one residents were declared U.A.L. but only four people were actually listed as escapees.

TABLE 16

EXPLANATION OF ESCAPE, UNLAWFULLY AT LARGE OR LATE ACTIVITIES

TYPE	N	% OF SAMPLE
None	504	87.5
Late return from pass	45	7.8
Unlawfully at large from pass	17	3.0
Escape/Unlawfully at large from C.R.C.	6	1.0
Escape from guard (returning to institution)	2	0.3
Went to unauthorized destination	1	0.2
Stranded due to storm	1	0.2
TOTAL	576	100.0

iv. Reasons for Termination of C.R.C. Stay

Over 85% of the sample remained in the C.R.C. until they had completed their incarceration. The bulk of the remainder (73) were returned to the parent institution with eight either escaping or being declared unlawfully at large. A more detailed breakdown of the reasons for termination of C.R.C. stay is provided in Table 17.

TABLE 17

REASON FOR COMPLETION OF C.R.C. STAY

	N	%
Satisfied sentence	409	71.0
Paroled	78	13.5
Released on appeal of sentence	2	0.3
Paid fine and released	2	0.3
Transferred to another C.R.C.	4	0.7
Returned to institution*	73	12.6
Escaped/unlawfully at large	8	1.4
TOTAL	576	100.0

* Two of those listed as terminating their C.R.C. stay by being returned to the institution were actually returned to the C.R.C. after about a week at the institution.

v. Residents Returned to the Institution

During their interviews, the institutional staff reported that inmates were returned to the institution for the most part because of the use of alcohol or drugs, a late return from a pass, not finding employment, or attitude or behaviour problems. Their impressions were supported by the information in the official records, which is presented in Table 18.

Very few of the residents (19, 3.3%) had committed infractions at the C.R.C. which would have constituted a criminal offence. Twelve individuals were returned to the institution due to psychiatric or medical problems which the C.R.C. may not have been able to deal with.

TABLE 18

REASON RETURNED TO INSTITUTION*

REASON	N	%
Alcohol use	18	22.22
U.A.L. (late)	16	19.75
Failure to abide by T.A.P. rules	12	14.82
Drug use	8	9.88
Disobey house rules	7	8.64
Failure to obtain employment	5	6.17
New charges	2	2.47
Escape	1	1.23
Other (i.e. psychiatric or medical problems)	12	14.82
TOTAL	81	100.00

* This represents all reasons for which the 73 residents were returned to the parent institution (i.e. 2 reasons were given for 8 residents).

F. FACTORS RELATED TO C.R.C. SUCCESS

For the purpose of this section of the report, C.R.C. residents who remained at the C.R.C. until the end of their incarceration or were transferred to another C.R.C. are defined as successful residents, while the residents who had escaped, were unlawfully at large or were returned to the parent institution from the C.R.C. are defined as unsuccessful residents. Factors distinguishing those who were successful from those who were unsuccessful are identified in Table 19.

i. Demographic Factors

TABLE 19

DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS RELATED TO COMPLETION STATUS

FACTOR	COMPLETION STATUS SUCCESSFUL N(495)	% (85.9)	UNSUCCESSFUL N(81)	% (14.1)	TOTAL N(100%)
Age (Years)					
16-20	109	76.2	34	23.8	143
21-25	153	89.5	18	10.5	171
26-35	136	91.3	13	8.7	149
36+	99	87.6	14	12.4	113
	$x^2 = 17.0$		d.f.=3	p<.001	
Employment History					
Full time	342	92.4	28	7.6	370
Sporadic/Unemployed	153	74.3	53	25.7	206
	$x^2 = 36.11$		d.f.=1	p<.001	
Age Left School					
Prior to 16	213	79.2	56	20.8	269
After 16	282	91.9	25	8.1	307
	$x^2 = 19.06$		d.f.=1	p<.001	
Educational Level					
Less than grade 10	342	83.8	66	16.2	408
Over grade 10	153	91.1	15	8.9	168
	$x^2 = 5.17$		d.f.=1	p<.025	

The age of a resident was found to be strongly related to C.R.C. success. Residents between the ages of 16 and 20 were twice as likely to fail at a C.R.C. as residents over the age of 20.

As indicated in Table 19, other factors found to be related to success included employment history and level of education. Residents who had a history of sporadic employment or were unemployed were more likely to be unsuccessful at a C.R.C. than residents who were employed. Offenders who had left school prior to, or at the age of 16, having achieved a grade 10 or less, were also more likely to fail at a C.R.C.

ii. Criminal History

Residents with prior convictions were much more likely to fail in a C.R.C. than first offenders. Those who had served a prior term of incarceration, however, were no more likely to fail in a C.R.C. than offenders with prior convictions but no incarceration. Among those who did have prior incarcerations, likelihood of failure increased with the length of that incarceration. None of those, in fact, with prior penitentiary terms were successful, although only five of the sample were in this category.

TABLE 20

PRIOR CRIMINAL DISPOSITION

BY COMPLETION STATUS

MOST SEVERE PRIOR DISPOSITION TYPE	COMPLETION STATUS SUCCESSFUL N	SUCCESSFUL %	UNSUCCESSFUL N	UNSUCCESSFUL %	TOTAL (100%) N
No prior conviction	223	95.3	11	4.7	234
Prior conviction, no incarceration	60	77.9	17	22.1	77
Prior incarceration <90 days	134	86.5	21	13.5	155
Prior incarceration ≥90 days <2 years	78	74.3	27	25.7	105
Prior incarceration ≥2 years	0	0.0	5	100.0	5
TOTAL	495	85.9	81	14.1	576

$x^2=63.45$ $d.f.=4$ $p<.001$

The mean number of prior aggregate days to which the unsuccessful residents had been sentenced to since 1975 was 229 days. This is more than triple the mean number of aggregate days of successful residents (73 days). {*t value = 3.1 d.f. = 83 p<.01* }

Individuals with prior parole revocations, escapes or U.A.L.'s on record were much more likely to be unsuccessful at a C.R.C.

Examination of the type of previous offences indicates that residents who had prior serious offences, sex offences, alcohol or drug offences were no more or less likely to fail in a C.R.C. programme than other offenders.

iii. Current Offence(s)

Inmates presently sentenced for multiple counts were more likely to fail at a C.R.C. than inmates sentenced for a single count. Inmates sentenced for 3 or more counts were twice as likely to be unsuccessful as those with one or two.

TABLE 21

NUMBER OF OFFENCE COUNTS LEADING TO PRESENT SENTENCE BY COMPLETION STATUS

NO. OF COUNTS	COMPLETION STATUS SUCCESSFUL N	%(85.9)	UNSUCCESSFUL N	%(14.1)	TOTAL N(100%)
1	271	90.9	27	9.1	298
2	108	86.4	17	13.6	125
3-5	91	78.4	25	21.6	116
6-9	25	67.6	12	32.4	37

$x^2=21.91$ $d.f.=3$ $p<.001$

The completion status for the sample, categorized according to the most serious offence, is shown in Table 22. The numbers involved in most categories are too small to warrant comment but certain patterns are worth noting. Interestingly, those in for offences involving drugs or alcohol were among the most likely to be successful. The break and enter category on the other hand had one of the highest portions of unsuccessful residents.

The relationship between sentence length and completion status is more clear cut (see Table 23). As the length of sentence increases, the likelihood of successful programme completion decreases. The mean sentence length among those who were successful was 123 days, compared to 221 days for those who were unsuccessful.

TABLE 22

MOST SERIOUS PRESENT OFFENCE

BY COMPLETION STATUS

PRESENT OFFENCE TYPE	COMPLETION STATUS SUCCESSFUL N	%	UNSUCCESSFUL N	%	TOTAL (100%) N
Homicide and Related	0	0.0	1	100.0	1
Serious Violent	11	78.6	3	21.4	14
Violent Sexual	6	100.0	0	0.0	6
Break, Enter and Related	73	70.9	30	29.1	103
Traffic/Import Drug	45	93.8	3	6.2	48
Weapons	5	71.4	2	28.6	7
Fraud and Related	34	81.0	8	19.0	42
Misc. Against Person	1	100.0	0	0.0	1
Theft/Possession	46	78.0	13	22.0	59
Assault and Related	29	85.3	5	14.7	34
Property Damage/Arson	8	100.0	0	0.0	8
Breach Justice	12	85.7	2	14.3	14
Possession Drugs	29	96.7	1	3.3	30
Traffic C.C. Non-Alcohol	19	95.0	1	5.0	20
Breach Court Order/Escape	29	93.5	2	6.5	31
Drinking Driving	126	96.2	5	3.8	131
Misc. Against Public Order	2	100.0	0	0.0	2
Other Federal Statutes	5	100.0	0	0.0	5
Parole Violation	1	50.0	1	50.0	2
H.T.A.	5	83.3	1	16.7	6
Liquor	4	100.0	0	0.0	4
Other Provincial Statutes	2	100.0	0	0.0	2
Unknown	3	50.0	3	50.0	6
TOTAL	495	85.9	81	14.1	576

TABLE 23

PRESENT AGGREGATE SENTENCE

BY COMPLETION STATUS

SENTENCE (MONTHS)	SUCCESSFUL N	SUCCESSFUL %	UNSUCCESSFUL N	UNSUCCESSFUL %	TOTAL N(100%)
Less than 1	152	96.2	6	3.8	158
1-3	154	89.0	19	11.0	173
3-6	101	81.5	23	18.5	124
6-12	60	74.1	21	25.9	81
12-18	21	72.4	8	27.6	29
18-24	7	63.6	4	36.4	11

$x^2 = 35.55$ $d.f. = 5$ $p < .001$

G. PERCEIVED PROBLEMS WITHIN THE C.R.C. NETWORK

During the staff interviews the respondents were asked if they perceived any problems to exist within the C.R.C. network. Over half of the Directors and one-third of the institutional staff felt that given the funding available, provincial expectations were too high with regards to the everyday operation of C.R.C.'s and the qualifications for C.R.C. staff.

Many of the subjects (14 Directors and 12 institutional staff) felt that the Ministry's classification system hindered adequate C.R.C. utilization. First of all, not all recommendations for C.R.C.'s made by Institutional Classification Officers are approved by the Main Office Inmate Classification and Transfer Branch. They also felt that Main Office placed too much emphasis on the inmate's offence type and that the inmate's classification could preclude his placement in a C.R.C. In addition, the classification process which usually takes about 12 days occasionally resulted in the loss of an inmate's job.

However, Main Office classification staff pointed out that the decision regarding C.R.C. placement is made by institutional staff. The Superintendent of each institution has the authority to grant T.A. to any inmate serving less than 90 days; however, institutional staff are encouraged to contact Main Office in order to obtain information about the inmate's previous institutional history to determine the appropriateness of a C.R.C. placement. Only inmates with aggregate sentences over 89 days in length have to be classified and all inmates with a minimum classification may be transferred to a

C.R.C. In addition, Regional Directors have the authority to override the Main Office decision for any inmate, including medium and maximum classifications, in order to send the inmate to a C.R.C.

In addition to the obstacles they perceived as created by the classification system, five of the C.R.C. Directors felt that the institution's policy or staff were imposing stricter controls than necessary upon C.R.C. inmates, and were viewing the C.R.C.'s as "mini-jails" rather than community residential settings.

On the other hand, many of the institutional staff members (12) believed that the C.R.C.'s Directors did not fully understand that accountability for an inmate remains with the superintendent of the parent institution even though the inmate has been transferred to a C.R.C. Concern was expressed about the C.R.C. staff's occasional neglect to inform the institution of serious inmate infractions, such as a two hour late return from a pass. This lack of communication between C.R.C.'s and institutions can create embarrassment for institutional staff if they are confronted by a member of the community, such as the press, concerning a C.R.C. resident's conduct within the community.

One-quarter of the C.R.C. Directors felt that they should have a greater input into the decisions affecting the C.R.C. residents. In fact they felt that their recommendations to various boards and agencies were often taken too lightly, if considered at all.

H. THE POTENTIAL FOR EXPANSION OF THE C.R.C. PROGRAMME

The C.R.C. Directors and institutional staff members were asked to consider the possibility of increasing C.R.C. utilization (counts). Most (twenty-one C.R.C. Directors and seventeen institutional staff members) considered it possible to increase C.R.C. occupancy rates in their areas. The following were listed as requirements for this increased utilization to take place:

- Increase in the number of available C.R.C. beds (4-D, 9-I);
- improvement in the identification and transfer process at the institutional level for appropriate inmates (5-D, 1-I);
- More information and assistance with application offered to inmates at time of admission (4-D, 1-I);
- Continuing high institutional counts (5-D, 2-I);
- Ministry's willingness to transfer slightly higher risk inmates (3-D, 4-I).

The remaining subjects gave the following reasons for not increasing C.R.C. utilization:

- C.R.C. does not have enough staff to increase counts (2-D, 1-I);
- unemployment situation in the C.R.C. community is discouraging (2-D, 4-I).

i. Current Situation

To assess properly the potential for expanded utilization of the C.R.C. programme, it is important to have a good picture of the current situation. This section reviews the availability of C.R.C. beds in different areas of the province and the utilization of those beds over the last fiscal year. Table 24 shows the C.R.C. beds available for male inmates according to the admitting institutions being served. To put these figures in perspective, they are related to the total sentenced admissions by males during 1981-82. The final column of this table shows the number of C.R.C. beds available for every 10,000 sentenced admissions. Table 25 shows the average utilization of these beds for sentenced inmates during 1982-83. Probationers, parolees and remands are not included in the table or in references to utilization in the remainder of this section.

Looked at together, these tables provide interesting insights into the current utilization of C.R.C.'s and the potential for expansion of the programme. Over the entire province there are 95 C.R.C. beds for every 10,000 sentenced admits.* During 1982-83 the number of sentenced male inmates in these beds ranged from 172 to 352, averaging 282 or 71% of available beds. These figures vary considerably when looking at the different regions of the province.

In the central region, the availability of beds is well below the provincial average (71 beds per 10,000 admits) and not surprisingly, the utilization of these beds is relatively high, averaging 88%. Utilization is highest in the Metropolitan Toronto area at 92%.

In the Northern Region, the availability of beds is also low (76 beds per 10,000 admits) but this is somewhat misleading because of the spread-out nature of the northern population. The figure for the whole region reflects the offsetting effects of four C.R.C.'s which are relatively large for the requirements in their specific areas, and a number of other small communities with no C.R.C.beds at all. The utilization of C.R.C. beds in the north for sentenced inmates is somewhat below the provincial average at 69%.

The Western Region is not unlike the North, in that the overall ratio of C.R.C. beds to admits is quite low

---

* *Based on 1981-82 admissions and June 1983 C.R.C. beds*

TABLE 24

C.R.C. BEDS PER 10,000 SENTENCED ADMISSIONS

ADMITTING INSTITUTIONS	SENTENCED MALE ADMITS 81-82	C.R.C.[1] BEDS	C.R.C.BEDS/ 10,000 SENTENCED ADMITS
CENTRAL REGION			
Toronto Jail)			
Metro East D.C.)-Mimico C.C.	12,179	89	73
Metro West D.C.)			
Hamilton-Wentworth D.C.	4,029	31	77
Barrie Jail	1,442	16	111
Niagara D.C.	1,569	-	-
TOTAL	19,219	136	71
NORTHERN REGION			
Sudbury Jail	1,125	13	116
Kenora Jail	1,344	14	104
Thunder Bay Jail*	1,274	-	-
Monteith Jail*	501	-	-
Sault Ste. Marie Jail	858	-	-
North Bay Jail	575	-	-
Parry Sound Jail	255	-	-
Fort Frances Jail	243	-	-
Haileybury Jail	256	-	-
(Th. Bay & Monteith C.C.s)	-	22	-
TOTAL	6,431	49	76
EASTERN REGION			
Ottawa-Carleton D.C.	1,782	28	157
Quinte D.C.	1,298	28	216
Whitby Jail	1,164	41	352
Peterborough Jail	585	13	222
Cornwall Jail	381	14	367
Brockville Jail	411	13	316
Lindsay Jail	353	-	-
Pembroke Jail	390	-	-
Cobourg Jail	354	-	-
Perth Jail	220	-	-
L'Original Jail	156	-	-
(Rideau C.C.)	-	16	-
TOTAL	7,094	153	216
WESTERN REGION			
Elgin-Middlesex D.C.	2,834	16	56
Windsor Jail	1,233	14	114
Brantford Jail*	965	-	-
Waterloo D.C.*	1,083	-	-
Owen Sound Jail	358	-	-
Walkerton Jail	304	-	-
Sarnia Jail	775	-	-
Chatham Jail	655	-	-
Stratford Jail	378	-	-
Wellington D.C.	521	-	-
(Burtch C.C.)	-	29	-
TOTAL	9,106	59	65
PROVINCIAL TOTAL	41,850	397	95

1. C.R.C. Beds do not include female C.R.C.'s, Glenn Thompson House for disabled inmates, or beds available through community residential agreements.

* Indicates admitting institutions with C.R.C.'s in their vicinity for which a correctional centre is the parent institution.

TABLE 25

C.R.C. UTILIZATION BY T.A. INMATES (1982-83)

ADMITTING INSTITUTIONS	C.R.C. BEDS	AVERAGE # ON T.A.	AVERAGE % UTILIZATION
CENTRAL REGION			
Toronto Jail)			
Metro East D.C.)- (Mimico C.C.)	89	82	92
Metro West D.C.)			
Hamilton-Wentworth D.C.	31	27	87
Barrie Jail	16	11	69
Niagara D.C.	-	-	-
TOTAL	136	119	88
NORTHERN REGION			
Sudbury Jail	13	8	62
Kenora Jail	14	10	71
Thunder Bay Jail	-	-	-
Monteith Jail	-	-	-
Sault Ste. Marie Jail	-	-	-
North Bay Jail	-	-	-
Parry Sound Jail	-	-	-
Fort Frances Jail	-	-	-
Haileybury Jail	-	-	-
(Th.Bay & Monteith C.C.)	22	16	73
TOTAL	49	34	69
EASTERN REGION			
Ottawa-Carleton D.C.	28	18	64
Quinte D.C.	28	14	50
Whitby Jail	41	28	68
Peterborough Jail	13	9	69
Cornwall Jail	14	6	43
Brockville Jail	13	7	54
Lindsay Jail	-	-	-
Pembroke Jail	-	-	-
Cobourg Jail	-	-	-
Perth Jail	-	-	-
L'Original Jail	-	-	-
(Rideau C.C.)	16	11	69
TOTAL	153	91	59
WESTERN REGION			
Elgin-Middlesex D.C.	16	13	81
Windsor Jail	14	9	64
Brantford Jail	-	-	-
Waterloo D.C.	-	-	-
Owen Sound Jail	-	-	-
Walkerton Jail	-	-	-
Sarnia Jail	-	-	-
Chatham Jail	-	-	-
Stratford Jail	-	-	-
Wellington D.C.	-	-	-
(Burtch C.C.)	29	17	59
TOTAL	59	38	97
PROVINCIAL TOTAL	397	282	75

(65 per 100,000) although certain areas are quite adequately served. The overall utilization rate, however, is also low, averaging 64%. The London Area (served by Elgin-Middlesex D.C.) is the exception with relatively few C.R.C. beds (56 per 10,000 admits) and high utilization averaging 81%.

The Eastern Region is by far the best served by this programme, having 216 C.R.C. beds for every 10,000 sentenced admissions. With this number of beds available, it is understandable that the average utilization is only 59%, the lowest in the province. It should be noted that the use of C.R.C. beds for probationers is much more prevalent in the Eastern Region than other areas of the province.

ii. The Use of C.R.C.'s for Remanded Individuals, Probationers and Parolees

A recent development in the C.R.C. programme has been the expanded use of these facilities for probationers, parolees or remanded individuals. At present these groups account for about 10% of the utilization of C.R.C. beds in the province. The C.R.C. Directors and the institutional staff members were asked to express their views regarding this use of C.R.C.'s. All of the subjects stated that priority was given to sentenced inmates with regards to available C.R.C. bedspace.

With the exception of four C.R.C. Directors, all of the staff interviewed felt that remanded individuals would cause a multitude of problems if they were housed in the same C.R.C. as sentenced inmates. It was stated that these individuals may present an escape risk and would be an unstable influence upon other residents as they are more difficult to discipline for rule infractions than sentenced inmates.

One-third of the C.R.C. Directors and over one-quarter of the institutional staff felt that the C.R.C. setting is as valid for probationers as for sentenced inmates given that both groups would have to be governed by the same rules and regulations. The remainder of the sample felt that C.R.C.'s were not appropriate for housing probationers due to the lack of disciplinary options.

Many of the staff members believed that parolees could be housed in the C.R.C.'s together with sentenced inmates if both groups were governed by the same rules and regulations. However, six Directors and ten institutional staff members felt that inmates paroled with the condition that they reside in a C.R.C. should be given T.A. status, rather than parole.

For the most part, the concerns expressed were more speculative than experiential. They are serious enough, however, to warrant caution in expanding C.R.C. utilization among these groups.

IV DISCUSSION

This report, and more specifically this discussion, focuses almost exclusively on the C.R.C. programme's potential role in helping to alleviate institutional crowding. The need to focus on overcrowding neither overlooks nor negates the importance of numerous other potential benefits of the programme.

Within the context of this study, the major finding indicates potential for the provision of additional relief to crowded institutions. However, this will not be accomplished through single, haphazard programme expansion. To alleviate institutional crowding, it is necessary to plan expansion in certain areas of the province effectively, and to improve the utilization of existing C.R.C. beds.

Examination of the current availability of C.R.C. beds reveals considerable disparity among the number of beds available, relative to potential demand, in different areas of the province. This likely reflects a wide range of historical factors such as differing degrees of support for the programme as it developed. Nonetheless, this situation limits the potential impact of the programme, at least in terms of the overcrowding problem. If the maximum benefit is to be realized, any future expansion of the programme will have to be planned to accommodate projected demand, primarily in areas where crowding is most critical.

It is conceivable that providing additional beds is of secondary importance, second in line only to the need for optimal utilization of whatever beds are available. The evidence from this study indicates that there is potential for increased utilization but not without certain changes.

Given the current economy and the limited marketable skills of many inmates, the potential to increase the numbers of employed residents may be severely limited. Consequently, to increase C.R.C. counts substantially, a reduction in the emphasis placed on employment as the major activity for residents is imperative. Evidence from this study indicates that for only a small portion of the residents are other activities such as education, job search and volunteer and community work, the predominant activity. Other uses for C.R.C.'s, such as housing those involved in out-patient type treatment, direct in-house treatment, or pre-release planning, represent potential which is largely untapped. Expansion of these other activities may be the only route to any appreciable increase. In order for these activities to become viable and acceptable alternatives, several adjustments may have to be made. For instance, the current funding arrangements for unemployed residents may have to be revised. In accordance with housing a greater number of unemployed residents with more spare time on their hands, the existing programming provided to C.R.C. residents would need to be expanded.

One group of potential residents, who rarely become C.R.C. programme candidates, are those initially classified to medium or maximum security correctional centres which do not have C.R.C.'s. Although mechanisms exist to transfer such inmates to an institution which has a C.R.C., they are cumbersome and rarely used. However, staff at both medium security institutions, and at Millbrook, felt that these institutions currently held inmates who would be suitable to spend some of their incarceration time in a C.R.C. It may be necessary either to improve the mechanisms for transferring such inmates to existing C.R.C.'s, or to provide houses specifically designated for this group.

Another aspect of C.R.C. selection which needs to be examined, is the differing opinions concerning appropriate lengths of stay. Although some concerns were expressed, this was much less likely to be seen as an issue for C.R.C. Directors than institutional staff. Extremely short stays were viewed as a nuisance, while the residents' ability to handle the "partial freedom" for too long a stay may be diminished. Specific programming for both groups might, however, reduce these concerns and expand the potential C.R.C. population.

An additional factor which must be addressed focuses upon the element of risk the Ministry is willing to incur in relation to the type of inmates sent to the C.R.C.'s. If the C.R.C. counts are to be increased, there is an implied need to increase the level of acceptable risk. Given the loosely defined criteria that currently exists, this is only true to a certain degree. What appears to be required is a better definition of the programme's entry requirements. At the local level, there is the feeling, at least by some, that it is safest to take a very cautious approach since one may be left "holding the can" if there is some sort of incident. What seems to be required is a better delineation of the criteria to be utilized in accordance with the assurance of support if these are followed.

It is interesting to compare the sample examined in this study with that of an earlier study of C.R.C.'s (Sone, 1976). It appears that a lower risk group of inmates are being placed in C.R.C.'s than previously. Although considerably more offenders in the current sample had alcohol related offences, the earlier sample were younger, less well educated and had more previous and current offences; all of which are factors usually associated with higher risk.

In assessing the potential impact on crowding, it is important to realize that increasing C.R.C. counts alone will do little to help the situation currently facing institutions. The C.R.C. programme, like many other programmes, is suited primarily for the lower risk inmates and this is important in viewing the impact of any expansion. The worst crowding is in institutions holding the medium and maximum risk inmates, and placing more minimum security inmates in C.R.C.'s, without concurrent changes in the distribution of institutional beds, will have minimal impact on the problem.

There also exists a situation where programmes and institutional activities are, in effect, competing for the same group of low risk inmates. This, in itself, does not diminish the potential value of any specific programme but should be kept in mind when considering expansion. It's all very well, for example, to point out that the need for kitchen staff is a poor justification for keeping an inmate in an unnecessarily secure institution. However, if Superintendents are to be encouraged to place these inmates into C.R.C.'s, some alternative means of putting the meals on the table will have to be devised. Similarly, a coordinated approach is required in areas where C.R.C.'s,community work projects, and parole all find themselves vying for the same inmates.

Another area which should be addressed is the ineffective communications which appear to exist among the various parties involved in running and selecting residents for C.R.C.'s. A number of examples came up of disparate views on different aspects of the programme. The most glaring example was the role of the Inmate Classification and Transfer Branch in the process. It is unclear whether or not perceptions held by some, that delays or restrictions are caused at the Main Office Classification stage, are valid. What is clear, however, is the need for a better understanding by all involved, of the views and procedures of the other parties.

V REFERENCES

Ardron, D.K. Community Resource Centres - A One Year Follow-Up Study, Ministry of Correctional Services, October, 1978.

Sone, Ian, Community Resource Centre Study, Ministry of Correctional Services, December, 1976.

Other Sources

Ministry of Correctional Services, Days Stay System.

Ministry of Correctional Services, Adult Information System.

APPENDIX A

DATA CONCERNING THE

576 ONTARIO C.R.C. RESIDENTS

(In tabular form)

TABLE i

DISTRIBUTION OF C.R.C. INMATES (C.R.C.'S)

C.R.C. *	SEX	N	% OF SAMPLE	C.R.C. CAPACITY
Durhamdale House (Pickering)	M	65	11.29	25
Calvert House (Hamilton)	M	41	7.12	15
Le Fraternite (Sudbury)	M	39	6.77	13
Durham Crest Centre (Oshawa)	M	33	5.73	16
Cuthbert House (Brampton)	M	33	5.73	14
Ellen Osler Home (Dundas)	M	30	5.21	16
Aberdeen House (Kingston)	M	28	4.86	14
Carleton Centre (Ottawa)	M	28	4.86	16
Kairos Centre (Thunder Bay)	M	26	4.51	16
Kawartha House (Peterborough)	M	26	4.51	13
Luxton Centre (London)	M	23	3.99	16
Robichaud House (Timmins)	M	21	3.65	6
Stanford House (Toronto)	M	19	3.30	16
Kitchener House (Kitchener)	M	18	3.13	16
MacMillan House (Barrie)	M	17	2.95	16
Madeira House (Etobicoke)	M	16	2.78	14
Maison-Decision House (Ottawa)	M	15	2.60	13
Onesimus House (Belleville)	M	14	2.43	14
Riverside House (Ottawa)	M	14	2.43	15
Robinson House (Windsor)	M	12	2.08	14
Victoria House (Brantford)	M	12	2.08	13
Red Lake Resource Centre (Red Lake)	M	11	1.91	14
Gerrard House (Toronto)	M	11	1.91	16
Ke-She-Ia-ing (Thunder Bay)	F	9	1.56	8
William Proudfoot House (London)	F	5	0.87	8
Joe Versluis Centre (Brockville)	M	4	0.70	13
Ferguson House (Ottawa)	F	3	0.52	8
Sherbourne House (Toronto)	M	3	0.52	15
TOTAL		576	100.00	393

*Information was not available from one of the 29 operational C.R.C.'s in Ontario.

TABLE ii

AGE OF RESIDENT

UPON ADMITTANCE TO THE C.R.C.

AGE	N	%
16 - 17	40	6.94
18 - 20	103	17.88
21 - 25	171	29.69
26 - 35	149	25.87
36 - 64	111	19.27
65+	2	0.35
TOTAL	576	100.00

Mean age of C.R.C. resident = 28.2 years.

Median age of C.R.C. resident = 24.9 years.

TABLE iii

MARITAL STATUS OF C.R.C. RESIDENTS

STATUS	N	%
Single	295	51.2
Married	130	22.6
Common-law	79	13.7
Divorced	28	4.9
Separated	42	7.3
Widowed	2	0.3
TOTAL	576	100.0

TABLE iv

HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE ACHIEVED

GRADE	N	%
1 - 8	96	16.67
9 - 10	236	40.97
11 - 13	217	37.67
Some University, College or Other	15	2.61
Not reported	12	2.08
TOTAL	576	100.00

TABLE v

USUAL OCCUPATION

OCCUPATION	N	%
None listed	38	6.6
Unemployed/compensation	4	0.7
Labourer	311	54.0
Professional or Technical	85	14.8
Student	37	6.4
Managerial	25	4.3
Craftsman	22	3.8
Personal Services	22	3.8
Retired	17	3.0
Clerical - Sales	13	2.3
Housewife	2	0.3
TOTAL	576	100.0

TABLE vi

CRIMINAL BACKGROUND OF C.R.C. RESIDENTS

ITEM		N (576)	%
No. of Escapes/U.A.L.'s on Record:	0	547	95.0
	1	23	4.0
	2	5	0.9
	3	1	0.2
No. of Previous Fines on Record:	0	434	75.3
	1	70	12.2
	2	26	4.5
	3	18	3.1
	4-10	22	3.8
	11-20	6	1.1
No. of Previous Probation Terms:	0	342	59.4
	1	188	32.6
	2	35	6.1
	3	7	1.2
	4	4	0.7
No. of Previous Paroles:	0	545	94.6
	1	28	4.9
	2	3	0.5
Total Previous Admissions: (from 1975)	0	217	37.7
	1	130	22.6
	2	73	12.7
	3-5	98	17.0
	6-10	46	8.0
	11-15	7	1.2
	16-21	5	0.8
No. of Previous Sentences under 90 days:	0	342	59.4
	1	103	17.9
	2	63	10.9
	3-5	53	9.2
	6-10	10	1.7
	11-20	5	0.9
No. of Previous Sentences over 90 days and less than 2 years:	0	468	81.2
	1	70	12.2
	2	21	3.6
	3-5	16	2.8
	6-7	1	0.2

...../2

TABLE vi CONTINUED

CRIMINAL BACKGROUND OF C.R.C. RESIDENTS

ITEM		N (576)	%
No. of Previous Sentences over 2 years (Federal Penitentiary time)	0	571	99.1
	1	4	0.7
	2	1	0.2
No. of Previous Serious Offences on Record (kidnap, murder, arson, assault, rape, robbery):	0	514	89.2
	1	39	6.8
	2	18	3.1
	3	3	0.5
	4	1	0.2
	5	1	0.2
No. of Previous Sex Offences:	0	570	99.0
	1	4	0.7
	2	1	0.2
	31*	1	0.2
No. of Previous Alcohol Related Offences:	0	409	71.0
	1	81	14.1
	2	34	5.9
	3-5	31	5.4
	6-10	11	1.9
	11-20	8	1.4
	21-40	2	0.3
No. of Previous Drug Related Offences:	0	531	92.2
	1	28	4.9
	2	13	2.3
	3	4	0.7
Total No. of Previous Counts (Offences):	0	234	40.6
	1	106	18.4
	2	49	8.5
	3	35	6.1
	4	24	4.2
	5-10	70	12.2
	11-20	41	7.1
	21-30	11	1.9
	31-40	2	0.3
	41-50	2	0.3
	51-66	2	0.3

*The resident with 31 previous offences was convicted of sex offences such as indecent exhibition and gross indecency.

TABLE vii

TYPE OF WORK WHILE AT C.R.C.*

TYPE OF WORK	N	%
None listed	132	22.9
Technical/Skilled labour	170	29.5
Labourer	146	25.4
Tradesman	71	12.3
Student	24	4.2
Clerical/Sales	19	3.3
Professional	7	1.2
Own Business	7	1.2
TOTAL	576	100.0

* This table lists the type of work for all of the residents working at any point during their C.R.C. stay.

TABLE viii

TYPE OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME

TYPE OF COURSE	NO. OF RESIDENTS	%
Not applicable	492	85.4
High School	42	7.3
University/College	16	2.8
Trade School	8	1.4
Upgrading	12	2.1
Correspondence	2	0.3
Basic Job Readiness Training	4	0.7
TOTAL	576	100.0

TABLE ix

NUMBER OF COMMUNITY WORK PLACEMENTS

DURING THE C.R.C. STAY

NUMBER OF PLACEMENTS	NUMBER OF RESIDENTS	% OF SAMPLE
0	431	74.8
1	87	15.1
2	39	6.8
3	19	3.3
TOTAL	576	100.0

TABLE x

COMMUNITY WORK PLACEMENT*

TYPE OF PLACEMENT	NO. OF PLACEMENTS	% OF TOTAL PLACEMENTS
Working for the city/community/ government	98	44.1
Working for parks/recreation/ snow removal	32	14.4
Working with the elderly	26	11.7
Working around a C.R.C.	20	9.0
Maintenance for a church/home	16	7.2
Working with the disabled	13	5.9
Working with children	7	3.2
Working for a hospital	7	3.2
Working with Natives	3	1.3
TOTAL	222	100.0

* This table represents the total number of community work placements for the 576 residents.

TABLE xi

PROGRAMME INVOLVEMENT DURING C.R.C. STAY*

PROGRAMME	LOCATION	NUMBER (LOCATION)	NUMBER (PROGRAMME)	PERCENT (TOTAL PROGRAMMES)
SOCIAL SKILLS				
Recreation	In house	42		
	Community	48		
	Both	49	139	15.6
House Meeting	In house	99		
	Community	3		
	Both	0	102	11.4
Life Skills	In house	50		
	Community	1		
	Both	11	62	6.9
Craft Activities (Woodworking)	In house	18		
	Community	2		
	Both	0	20	2.2
St. Johns First Aid	In house	9		
	Community	1		
	Both	0	10	1.1
Financial-Budget Counselling	In house	2		
	Community	1		
	Both	0	3	0.3
TOTAL SOCIAL SKILLS			(336)	(37.5)
DRUG/ALCOHOL				
A.A. (Alcoholics Anonymous)	In house	96		
	Community	92		
	Both	41	229	25.6
Drug/Alcohol Therapy-Education	In house	55		
	Community	8		
	Both	5	68	7.6
N.A. (Narcotics Anonymous)	In house	0		
	Community	10		
	Both	0	10	1.1
TOTAL DRUG/ALCOHOL			(307)	(34.3)

TABLE xi CONTINUED

PROGRAMME INVOLVEMENT DURING C.R.C. STAY*

PROGRAMME	LOCATION	NUMBER (LOCATION)	NUMBER (PROGRAMME)	PERCENT (TOTAL PROGRAMMES)
COUNSELLING				
General Counselling	In house	101		
	Community	6		
	Both	1	108	12.1
Legal Counselling	In house	25		
	Community	0		
	Both	0	25	2.8
Psychiatric Aid	In house	20		
	Community	3		
	Both	0	23	2.6
Family Counselling	In house	2		
	Community	3		
	Both	0	5	0.6
TOTAL COUNSELLING			(161)	(18.1)
EDUCATION/EMPLOYMENT				
Spiritual Development	In house	37		
	Community	5		
	Both	5	47	5.3
Community Development (Volunteer work)	In house	2		
	Community	15		
	Both	7	24	2.7
Manpower - Job Search Counselling	In house	0		
	Community	9		
	Both	1	10	1.1
Upgrading Course	In house	0		
	Community	9		
	Both	0	9	1.0
TOTAL EDUCATION/EMPLOYMENT			(90)	(10.1)
TOTAL PROGRAMMES			894	100.0

*This table represents the total number of programmes attended by the 576 C.R.C. residents.

TABLE xii

NUMBER OF PROGRAMMES
RECOMMENDED BUT NOT ATTENDED
BY C.R.C. RESIDENTS

NO. OF PROGRAMMES RECOMMENDED	NO. OF RESIDENTS	% OF SAMPLE
0	471	81.8
1	84	14.6
2	19	3.3
3	2	0.3
TOTAL	576	100.0

TABLE xiii

PROGRAMMES RECOMMENDED (NOT ATTENDED)*

PROGRAMME	NO. (RESIDENTS)	% (TOTAL PROGRAMMES)
Alcoholic Anonymous	41	32.0
Drug or Alcohol Education	23	18.0
Recreation/Crafts	14	10.9
School-Educational Programme	14	10.9
Life Skills	13	10.2
Psychiatric Counselling	7	5.5
Family Counselling	4	3.1
Religious Counselling	4	3.1
Narcotics Anonymous	3	2.3
Financial Counselling	3	2.3
Impaired Drivers	2	1.6
TOTAL	128	100.0

*This table represents all recommended programmes which were not attended by the 576 C.R.C. residents.

TABLE xiv

REASON FOR NOT ATTENDING A RECOMMENDED PROGRAMME

REASON	N(RESIDENTS)	%(REASONS)
Offender refused to attend	46	42.2
Length of stay too short to benefit	27	24.8
Scheduling Problems (with work or school)	19	17.4
Not available in the C.R.C. area	15	13.8
Other needs of resident (priorize needs)	2	1.8
TOTAL	109*	100.0

* 2 reasons were listed for 4 residents.

TABLE xv

POST-RELEASE INVOLVEMENT WITH AGENCY OR PROGRAMME

TYPE OF PROGRAMME	N	%
Not applicable	460	79.9
Alcoholics Anonymous	42	7.3
C.R.C. Aftercare	19	3.3
Educational Programme	15	2.6
Therapy and Counselling	15	2.6
Recreational Programme	8	1.4
Community Work	6	1.0
Drug-Alcohol treatment	5	0.9
Life skills	4	0.7
Religious Counselling	2	0.3
TOTAL	576	100.0